



DRAFT

Minutes

Thursday, August 10, 2006

Virginia Information Technologies Agency (VITA) Auditorium
110 South Seventh Street, Richmond, VA

Attendance

Members Present:

The Honorable Aneesh Chopra
Hiram R. Johnson, Vice Chair
Kenneth S. Johnson, Sr.
Walter J. Kucharski

James F. McGuirk, II, Chair
Leonard M. Pomata
Alexander "Sandy" Thomas

Members Absent:

Mary Guy Miller, Ph.D.
Scott D. Pattison

Others Present:

Lemuel C. Stewart, Jr., Chief Information Officer of the Commonwealth
Julie Whitlock, Office of the Attorney General
Marcella Williamson, ITIB Executive Director

Call to Order

Chairman James F. McGuirk, II, called the meeting of the Information Technology Investment Board (ITIB) to order at approximately 1:05 p.m. He asked Marcella Williamson to call the roll. The presence of a quorum was confirmed.

Collaboration on Recommended Technology Investment Projects (RTIP)

Chairman McGuirk said the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the RTIP, which goes to the Governor and General Assembly each year. He said there was quite a bit of discussion at the July meeting regarding collaboration, which the ITIB began pushing last year. He said the response has been very good. He said two individuals asked to address the ITIB on the subject of collaboration on IT projects.

David Paylor, Director of the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), said DEQ began working on electronic storage of documents in 1999. He said it took years to design, get standards in place, scan documents, etc., for one division. Now, however, he said everyone has realized that document management has wonderful opportunities for the business at

DEQ. He said document management is good for the public because there is more access to documents. He said now it would take only two or three years for the remainder of the department to move to document management because of advances in technology. He said there are additional opportunities through collaboration because other agencies have undertaken this project. He said DEQ has begun to discuss collaboration with VITA and other agencies.

Mr. Paylor said DEQ believes there are opportunities where enterprise solutions make sense. He said DEQ is excited about the possibility of meeting its business needs by talking with other agencies and coordinating resources so that the cost is less than it would have been for individual agencies. He said DEQ believes there is an opportunity for document management collaboration, and that such collaboration would cost less for DEQ and would provide a solution sooner. He thanked the ITIB for championing enterprise solutions.

Chairman McGuirk thanked Mr. Paylor. Chairman McGuirk said everyone likes the idea of collaboration and talks about the benefits, but individuals and agencies must step forward and takes leadership roles. He congratulated Mr. Paylor and DEQ for stepping forward. Mr. Paylor said it is clear that in some cases the silo approach to IT is going to increase the cost. He said there will be times when individual organizations have sufficiently unique needs that collaboration is not going to work. He said, however, agencies must seek collaborative solutions, and that document management is one area where the collaboration approach is going to work.

Gail Jaspen, Deputy Secretary for Health and Human Resources (HHR), said she came on behalf of Secretary Marilyn Tavenner to assure the ITIB that the 13 agencies under HHR recognize that some collaboration will create some efficiencies. She said HHR pledges its efforts to collaborate among HHR agencies. She said that Secretary Chopra took the lead and convened a meeting of HHR agency representatives to discuss enterprise collaborations. She said the goal is to explore electronic health records. She said in the short term, opportunities for a master patient index will be explored. She said the HHR agencies will look for additional opportunities for collaborations.

Chairman McGuirk said the health area is a priority for the citizens of the Commonwealth and one of the Governor's key focuses. He said he appreciates the leadership of the Secretary and Deputy Secretary because the health area is one that has, in the past, created silos by trying to solve individual problems. He said the ITIB appreciates HHR stepping forward.

Recommended Technology Investment Report

Constance Scott, VITA Project Management, said the objectives of the meeting are to obtain the ITIB priorities for the 2006 RTIP and establish specific recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly to incorporate into the report. Ms. Scott reviewed the code requiring the report by September 1, and recapped the RTIP selection process.

Ms. Scott said the CIO recommends moving the Enterprise Applications Program from priority #6 to #1, and moving the integrated social services delivery system with Mapper replacement from #2 to #29 to provide for the project to be better structured and phased in while addressing critical business needs at the Department of Social Services.

George Williams, VITA Project Management, said in response to the ITIB's direction, the staff analyzed projects for collaboration. He said 13 of the 21 active projects have ongoing collaboration activities, while 16 of 29 approved for planning have collaboration potential. Five collaboration opportunity groups were identified, including electronic health records,

public safety, document management, E-911 and GIS. Mr. Williams said those with potential collaboration opportunities were grouped in three categories: joint development, program collaboration and functional collaboration. Total cost is \$803 million.

Mr. Williams said the portfolio summary includes 56 projects totaling \$820 million after the IT Infrastructure Partnership was removed from the list. He said the 56 projects include those active and approved for planning that were represented in the \$803 total, and seven identified for preliminary planning estimated to cost approximately \$17 million not yet ready for the RTIP report.

Mr. Pomata asked about the total cost estimate at completion and whether the entire cost of the project is included even if part of the funding already has been spent. Mr. Williams said the portfolio includes the total cost estimate even if some of the funding already has been expended.

Mr. Kenneth Johnson asked if the active projects total 59.9 percent of the portfolio total. Mr. Williams said that is correct.

Mr. Pomata noted that the chart does not designate how much been expended, so the \$820 million does not represent total expenditure needed going forward.

Mr. Williams said projects in the "identified for preliminary planning" category are in that grouping because the business case for the project was not solid enough to be recommended for approval for planning at this point, the project should be reviewed to see if it might be part of the Enterprise Application (EA) Program, or the project was recommended by the Secretary of Technology while collaboration is explored.

Mr. Kucharski noted that some of the seven were identified for planning, but now are on hold until the Enterprise Application implications are considered.

Mr. Williams said the recommendation is that funding be maintained for the 20 active projects and recommend funding for the 29 approved for planning. He said that the cost is \$234 in general funds and \$140 million in non-general funds for a total of \$374.6 million for the 2006-08 biennium.

Mr. Pomata noted that if a project goes for another four years, there is a financial commitment beyond the 2006-08 biennium budget.

Mr. Thomas said it might be useful to have an understanding of funding requirements in future years. Board members asked several questions about how much is required to fund the projects beyond the request for the two-year biennium. Chairman McGuirk said additional information should be available, including the cost incurred to date on the project, the cost recommended for this budget funding cycle and the remaining cost to be funded. He said staff members should report those numbers and notate that the numbers are self-reported by the agencies. He said the multi-year funding breakdown is needed to provide information for the Governor and General Assembly in the report.

Ms. Scott presented "future considerations" from the last RTIP process and brought forward those with work remaining. She recommend that the ITIB discuss synchronizing the IT strategic planning schedule and RTIP publication date. She said three of the remaining items would be addressed by the committee being chaired by Secretary Chopra that is determining alternative funding mechanisms. Those three, she said, include establishing alternate funding mechanisms, obtaining funding to support the implementation of a two-stage planning process, and mapping funding of the project for the life of the investment.

Mr. Thomas asked if an evaluation has been performed to determine if the Governor and General Assembly are using the RTIP as a guide for IT investments. Ms. Scott said a reconciliation report will be provided on the portfolio as a whole.

Ms. Scott said the recommendations are:

- That the ITIB approve the 2006 Major IT Projects Recommended for funding lists, which requests that:
 - The Governor and General Assembly maintain funding for active major IT projects
 - The Governor and General Assembly appropriate funds for those major projects in Approved for Planning status
- That the ITIB direct the CIO to prepare the 2006 RTIP Report for ITIB review (with a planned three-day review period)
- That the ITIB authorize the Chairman of the ITIB (without objection by a board member during the review period) to submit the report to the governor and General Assembly on September 1

Ms. Scott also presented the schedule for completion of the report by September 1.

Mr. Pomata asked about the green, yellow and red status of any projects listed, to ensure that the projects are healthy and ongoing. Mr. Williams said all are being managed to the point where they are not at-risk. One currently is red with a corrective action plan. Mr. Pomata asked if a project is in jeopardy of failing, would funding be stopped. Mr. Williams said in a monthly review process independent of RTIP, the status is determined and funding could be halted if a project is at-risk.

Chairman McGuirk said the RTIP is an annual process, and if a project is in trouble that funding could be stopped at any time. He said there should be a comment in the RTIP that if a project is at risk, funding might be terminated. He said he would like to seek the status of each project and comments included in the report that the yellow and red projects are under scrutiny. He said that since VITA was formed, there has a tremendous improvement recognized by everyone that projects are done in a methodical and organized way. He said the RTIP should notate whether projects are yellow and red and under review.

Mr. Kucharski said RTIP recommends funding, but if a project is at-risk it could be terminated even prior to the General Assembly session for consideration of the RTIP. He asked that such notation be made in the RTIP.

The list of 29 projects recommended for funding and 20 recommended for planning was displayed (the charts follows at the end of this document).

Mr. Kucharski asked for clarification on the meaning of functional collaboration. He said he believes purchasing from a statewide contract does not represent functional collaboration. The CIO said functional is procurement collaboration. He said it leverages finances and provides benefits, but is not business process collaboration. He said it is the beginning stage of joint collaboration.

Chairman McGuirk said he it is functional collaboration if there was collaboration on the common solution, including the development, design and requirements.

Mr. Pomata asked if the agencies have seen the collaborative suggestions. Mr. Williams said the ITIB has the results of the staff analysis from 18 agencies, but that information has not been shared widely with agencies. He asked for clarification on the comments about the three categories of collaboration, specifically the "should be mandated by Code or executive

order” comment on the joint development collaboration. Mr. Ziomek said the analysis was a thought piece for the ITIB that attempts to classify whether the projects could be collaborative. He said the comments are suggested strategies that could be used if collaboration is a requirement, and would determine the impact going forward. He said ITIB strategies must be put in place to make it effective. Mr. Pomata agreed that the comments and descriptions should be used going forward, and wanted to make sure the ITIB understood the suggestions.

Mr. Kucharski asked if the collaboration information will be included in the report. Chairman McGuirk said collaboration should be indicated in the RTIP. He stressed that functional means making a decision on the same solution, not the act of purchasing off a state contract. Mr. Ziomek said the definitions will be reworked and shared with the ITIB. Chairman McGuirk said it is important to note in the RTIP that 18 of the 29 new projects are collaborative efforts.

Mr. Kenneth Johnson said it would be helpful to include the objectives for collaboration in the report. Chairman McGuirk said he wants to see that in the executive summary in the front of the report.

Chairman McGuirk said the recommendation is that the ITIB approve the projects in the two categories: active and planning. He said the ITIB also has indicated that the green, yellow and red status be designated for the 20 active projects with a notation that those in yellow and red may be in danger of losing funding if they do not improve in their status. He said comments should be added to designate those that are collaborative on the 29 planning projects. The additional parts of the recommendation are to have the CIO prepare the report, and the ITIB Chair to submit the report to the Governor and General Assembly after the appropriate ITIB reviews.

CIO Stewart asked for clarification on whether the ITIB wanted funding approval contingent on collaboration. Mr. Pomata said if it is joint development, that the General Assembly and Governor should set aside money earmarked for that project in a separate fund so that projects are implemented collaboratively.

CIO Stewart said the ITIB is in a position to recommend a central fund for collaborative projects. He there needs to be a program office that spans multiple agencies for enterprise initiatives, just like the EA Program.

Chairman McGuirk said the types of collaboration being fostered should be discussed in the report, including the joint development with the recommendation to put funds in a single place and agencies getting together to find common solutions.

Secretary Chopra said he does not want undue burden placed on an individual who or an agency that has stepped forward to work collaboratively. He said his office is going to work to find resources to support the individuals and agencies that want to collaborate. He said it still must be determined how such collaboration can be supported.

Mr. Kucharski said interim alternatives could be developed. He said language could be included in the appropriate act that the CIO review and make recommendations to Planning and Budget for the pooling of funds.

Mr. Kenneth Johnson said collaboration is an initiative, and the CIO has moved it forward and should continue his charge.

Chairman McGuirk said alternative methods of funding should be considered for collaborative programs, but it has not been determined that there are other single source solutions in the projects being considered where the money could be placed in central fund. He said language could be included in the report that some central funding should be considered as a vehicle for projects that are collaborative. He said the example of central funding – the Enterprise Applications Program – should be expanded for programs that are collaborative.

Mr. Thomas said the ITIB does not want to move to a post-funding environment where the wheels of collaboration fall off. Chairman McGuirk said the purpose of collaboration is that the funding needs to be pooled so use of funds can be more efficiently.

Secretary Chopra said everyone agrees collaborative projects need a different method of funding, and noted that he and the Secretary of Finance have been asked to find alternative methods of funding.

Chairman McGuirk said that from a business practice standpoint, there needs to be a pooling of resources for projects with a common goal. He said the ITIB does not want to presuppose the alternatives, but the ITIB wants to say the state can not have collaborative projects and fund them as they have been funded.

The CIO noted that the program management process must be adjusted to accommodate the collaborative process. He said the ITIB was set up to look at Commonwealth-wide practices that make better use of technology funds in a more efficient way. He said the funding process must be changed to do that or IT can not be more efficient.

Chairman McGuirk made the motion, seconded by Mr. Thomas:

"I move that the ITIB recommend approval of the RTIP report, including:

- Approval of the 20 active projects with the designation of green, yellow and red status for each project and that comments be included in the report that if projects designated yellow and red do not improve funding will be terminated*
- Approval of 29 projects for planning, annotating the 18 that been deemed to have collaborative potential*
- Language about the collaborative stages – both in the area of single solution joint development with funding going into the investment fund and for collaborative projects with a look at alternative funding*
- The CIO prepare the report for ITIB review*
- The Chairman submit the report to the Governor and General Assembly by September 1"*

The motion was adopted on a unanimous voice vote.

Other Business

Mr. Kenneth Johnson asked that the collaborative initiative be given a title, broken into two phases with the current process as Phase I and the funding process as Phase II, and that a strategy be developed to look at projects on the front end.

Secretary Chopra said the last four weeks have been a remarkable period for ITIB. He said the ITIB recognized a suboptimal set of projects in the RTIP, and came together as a group and sent the message that collaboration is essential to innovation and efficiency. He said

dozens of conversations took place in the last four weeks about this vision, and that the response from the Governor's Office and agencies has been overwhelming. He said he agrees with Mr. Kenneth Johnson that a mechanism must be found to look at projects on the front end for collaboration and nurture and support them.

Mr. Pomata said the staff did an excellent job responding to the ITIB to provide information. He said the ITIB should look at strategies for the Commonwealth for IT, how data is collected, what criteria is used and what collaboration means. He said the process can be improved for next year.

Mr. Kucharski asked if the business enterprise architecture information has been updated. Paul Lubic, VITA Technology Solutions and Strategy, reported that work is getting under way. Mr. Kucharski asked if that process could look at commonalities and opportunities for collaboration. He said this would be an "as is" look at where the systems stand and where the opportunities might exist. Mr. Lubic said staff will identify what information is required for each line of business sub-function and what applications and solutions support the delivery of that information. He said that will be done in development of the information architecture and solutions architecture, which are under way and should be complete this fiscal year.

Mr. Kucharski asked if the result of that work will provide the ability to tell where state agencies are doing the same things multiple times. Mr. Lubic said at a high level.

Mr. Kenneth Johnson said he is simply asking for a strategy for collaboration so the CIO has direction for the second phase.

Mr. Lubic said the Commonwealth Strategic Plan for IT provides for multiple initiatives that require collaboration across state agencies. Mr. Kenneth Johnson said the strategy may not be as clear as it should be or the collaboration discussion would not be taking place around the RTIP.

Chairman McGuirk said the RTIP process has taken place for four times and there must be a more strategic look at the requirements of the Commonwealth rather than having each agency providing a wish list. He said the staff does a tremendous job pulling it together. Chairman McGuirk as for a straw man by the October meeting to look at the RTIP process from a strategic view as to exactly what the Commonwealth does and how do we try to improve that without reorganizing government. He said the ITIB should look at needs top down not bottom up and determine where agency processes intersect.

Chairman McGuirk said the ITIB mission is to try to look at how the ITIB can improve what is being done by applying technology and investing technology funds to make improvements. He said the ITIB wants a different process than the ground-up process. He said the RTIP process needs to be re-engineered, and that he wants discussions in upcoming ITIB meetings so that the process is different next year. Secretary Chopra said that in the current process, the ITIB is reacting to agencies. He agreed that the ITIB needs to be more proactive.

Mr. Pomata said as part of this process, the ITIB might ask some secretaries and deputy secretaries to elaborate on the business needs with respect to IT. He said there is an agency strategic plan process, and the ITIB should synchronize the RTIP work with that process. He also suggested annual strategic planning meetings with the Council of Virginia's Future representatives and others representatives of the Commonwealth.

Chairman McGuirk asked the CIO to have staff develop a straw man and use the strategic part of the next couple of ITIB meetings to discuss the process and how to make it more strategic.

CIO Stewart said the work of Secretary's Chopra's committee surrounding accessible capital is important so that when an idea is introduced funds can be allocated.

Mr. Hiram Johnson suggested that ITIB members need to get involved in speaking engagements to let others know about what is going on with the ITIB and state, and determine their IT issues and how the ITIB, VITA and the Secretary of Technology can get involved.

Public Comment

Chairman McGuirk solicited public comment. There was none.

Adjournment

Mr. Pomata moved for adjournment, seconded by Mr. Hiram Johnson. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:25 p.m.

ITIB Rank	Project ID	Secretariat	Agency	Project Title	Planned Start	Planned End	Total Project Cost (Estimate at Completion)	Est. Total FY07 Cost	Est. Total FY08 Cost	Funding Status	FY05 RTIP
Recommended for Maintained Funding (Active Projects)											
Not Ranked	1000207	Administration	SBE	Virginia Election and Registration Information System (VERIS)	9/1/03	1/1/06	\$12,000,000	\$5,460,000	\$3,890,000	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1002072	Agriculture & Forestry	DOF	Integrated Forest Resources Information System – Forest Protection & Mobile Computing	4/12/06	7/30/07	\$1,075,532	\$996,786	\$78,746	Full	No
Not Ranked	1000241	Commerce and Trade	DPOR	Electronic Access to the Government Licensing and Enforcement System(EAGLES)	8/19/04	9/1/06	\$1,499,000	\$146,000	\$0	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1001467	Commerce and Trade	VEC	Replace VWNIS	10/1/05	6/30/07	\$4,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$1,000,000	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000744	Education	JYF	JYF Ticketing Improvements	12/9/05	10/1/06	\$450,000	\$90,000	\$0	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000137	Education	LU	Purchase and Install Enterprise Resource Program (ERP)	2/28/05	3/30/09	\$7,759,421	\$2,321,188	\$1,735,135	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1001096	Education	VCCS	Administrative Information System (AIS)	5/1/06	2/4/08	\$8,912,835	\$5,831,656	\$3,081,179	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000238	Education	VCU	Modernization of Communications Infrastructure (ACES)	4/1/05	1/30/07	\$13,054,947	\$2,037,023	\$1,762,000	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000237	Education	VCU	Administrative Systems Replacement (ARIES)	5/1/04	11/1/07	\$11,357,000	\$3,764,000	\$3,532,000	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000100	Education	VSU	Re-engineer Core Business Processes	4/1/04	9/30/07	\$5,779,506	\$2,651,360	\$1,618,841	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000095	Health & Human Resources	DRS	Integrated Case Management (ICM) Project	12/1/00	12/30/08	\$5,200,000	\$1,492,000	\$1,563,000	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1001309	Public Safety	DOC	Phase 2 and Phase 3 of VirginiaCORIS Program	8/15/06	10/15/09	\$12,900,000	\$7,800,000	\$5,100,000	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000756	Public Safety	VSP	Statewide Agencies Radio System	7/1/99	12/31/11	\$370,000,000	\$56,920,118	\$67,540,187	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000395	Technology	VITA	Commonwealth Technology Portfolio Version 2, Phase 2	9/15/05	12/30/06	\$2,831,919	\$1,046,454	\$1,785,465	Full	Yes

ITIB Rank	Project ID	Secretariat	Agency	Project Title	Planned Start	Planned End	Total Project Cost (Estimate at Completion)	Est. Total FY07 Cost	Est. Total FY08 Cost	Funding Status	FY05 RTIP
Not Ranked	1002137	Technology	VITA	PeopleSoft Business Planning and Budgeting	7/15/05	10/6/06	\$1,288,680	\$0	\$0	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000782	Technology	VITA	Road Centerline / Addressing (Virginia Base Mapping Program)	3/1/03	5/31/07	\$3,100,000	\$1,275,000	\$0	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1002133	Transportation	DMV	PCs on The Front Counters	7/1/06	2/28/07	\$4,785,715	\$4,785,715	\$0	Full	No
Not Ranked	1001462	Transportation	DMV	Traffic Records Electronic Data System (TREDS)	6/1/05	1/31/09	\$4,345,000	\$1,460,300	\$1,237,000	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1001468	Transportation	VDOT	Electronic Toll Customer Service and Violation Enforcement System	4/18/05	3/31/07	\$13,826,000	\$2,219,000	\$0	Full	Yes
Not Ranked	1000209	Transportation	VDOT	Roadway Network Systems	7/1/04	4/7/08	\$6,470,486	\$1,883,539	\$723,084	Full	Yes
Number = 20							\$491,136,041	\$105,680,139	\$94,646,637		
Recommended for Funding (Approved for Planning)											
1	1002206	Finance	SFIN	Implementation of the Enterprise Applications Master Services Agreement (Phase 1)	FY07	FY08	\$11,000,000	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	Full-GF	No
2	1000234	Health & Human Resources	DMHMR	Clinical Applications/EMR	FY07	FY08	\$15,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$10,000,000	Not funded	No
3	1001678	Commerce and Trade	VEC	Unemployment Insurance	FY07	FY10	\$45,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	Full-NGF	No
4	1001503	Public Safety	VSP	Virginia Records Management System	FY07	FY09	\$4,500,000	\$1,750,000	\$2,125,000	Partial-NGF	Yes
5	1001580	Public Safety	VDEM	Statewide Alert Network (SWAN)	FY07	FY08	\$200,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	Partial-NGF	Yes
6	1002205	Public Safety	VSP	Virginia Intelligence Management System	FY07	FY09	\$8,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,000,000	Not funded	No
7	1002131	Health & Human Resources	VDH	Electronic Health Record - Pilot	FY07	FY08	\$720,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	Full-NGF	No

ITIB Rank	Project ID	Secretariat	Agency	Project Title	Planned Start	Planned End	Total Project Cost (Estimate at Completion)	Est. Total FY07 Cost	Est. Total FY08 Cost	Funding Status	FY05 RTIP
8	1001586	Technology	VITA	Next Generation E-911	FY07	FY10	\$10,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	Full-NGF	No
9	1000133	Public Safety	VSP	Central Criminal Repository Improvement	FY07	FY09	\$8,375,653	\$2,591,884	\$1,183,769	Not funded	Yes
10	1001521	Health & Human Resources	DMHMR	Medication Management System Procurement	FY07	FY09	\$7,400,787	\$4,410,844	\$611,474	Not funded	No
11	1001577	Education	VSU	New Engineering Building Technology	FY07	FY07	\$953,800	\$953,800	\$0	Full-GF	No
12	1000129	Public Safety	VSP	Statewide Mug-shot and Other Images Repository	FY07	FY08	\$950,000	\$600,000	\$350,000	Full-GF	Yes
13	1002203	Public Safety	VSP	Enhancement of the AFIS system - Palm Print Search	FY07	FY08	\$1,250,000	\$600,000	\$650,000	Full-GF	No
14	1001073	Administration	DGS	Real Estate Portfolio Management	FY07	FY08	\$1,000,000	\$700,000	\$300,000	Partial-GF	Yes
15	1002207	Public Safety	VSP	Replacement and Enhancement of the Statewide Incident-Based Reporting System	FY08	FY10	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$500,000	Not funded	No
16	1002200	Technology	VITA	VITA IT Accessibility Compliance	FY07	FY10	\$1,800,000	\$400,000	\$600,000	Full-NGF	No
17	1000255	Transportation	DMV	Integrated Systems Redesign	FY07	FY09	\$32,600,000	\$4,800,000	\$16,000,000	Partial-GF	Yes
18	1000119	Administration	DGS	Seat of Government Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP)	FY07	FY08	\$800,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	Not funded	Yes
19	1001506	Natural Resources	DEQ	Document Management Implementation	FY07	FY09	\$1,140,000	\$570,000	\$456,000	Full-GF	Yes

ITIB Rank	Project ID	Secretariat	Agency	Project Title	Planned Start	Planned End	Total Project Cost (Estimate at Completion)	Est. Total FY07 Cost	Est. Total FY08 Cost	Funding Status	FY05 RTIP
20	1002209	Public Safety	VSP	Replacement and Enhancement of the Central Criminal History (CCH) Application	FY07	FY08	\$3,474,347	\$500,000	\$2,974,347	Full-GF	No
21	1002282	Education	VCCS	New Human Resources Information System (HRIS)	FY08	FY08	\$6,468,280	\$0	\$6,468,280	Not funded	No
22	1001583	Public Safety	VDEM	GIS	FY07	FY08	\$100,000	\$75,000	\$25,000	Not funded	Yes
23	1000188	Natural Resources	VMNH	Adventure Classroom	FY08	FY08	\$2,200,000	Note 1	\$1,400,000	Not funded	Yes
24	1001970	Education	RU	Procure new Administrative Systems software	FY07	FY10	\$9,626,997	\$3,649,555	\$2,566,300	Partial-NGF	No
25	1001677	Technology	VITA	Integrated Business Processes/Chargeback System	FY08	FY09	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$3,000,000	Not funded	No
26	1000761	Administration	SBE	Campaign Finance Management System	FY07	FY07	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0	Not funded	Yes
27	1000103	Education	RU	Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) Telephone System Project	FY07	FY09	\$1,131,047	\$80,000	\$80,000	Full-GF	No
28	1001473	Transportation	VDOT	Equipment Management System (EMS) Upgrade	FY07	FY07	\$4,000,000	\$2,000,000	Note 1	Full-NGF	No
29	1000225	Health & Human Resources	DSS	Integrated Social Services Delivery System (with MAPPER Replacement)	FY07	FY12	\$128,000,000	\$7,571,681	\$18,840,800	Not funded	Yes
Number = 29							\$312,190,911	\$60,112,764	\$94,490,970		
Recommendation Totals											
Number = 49							\$803,326,952	\$165,792,903	\$189,137,607		